

S/N: 09/222,554
Response to Office Action dated 4/18/06
Amendment dated 7/18/06

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, and 13-25 are pending in the application. Claim 16 has been amended.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to distinctly claim the present invention. The preamble of claim 16 has been amended to more succinctly reflect the body of the claim. In view of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 13-14, 17-22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,739 (hereinafter “Skopp”) in view of Broder et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,037,135 (hereinafter “Broder”) in view of Cooper et al. , U.S. Patent No. 6,1010,503 (“Cooper”). Claims 4-7 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp, Border and Cooper in further view of Markowitz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,311,185 B1 (hereinafter “Markowitz”). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp, Broder, and Cooper in further view of Yu, U.S. Patent No. 6,067,552 (hereinafter “Yu”). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in view of the following arguments.

The Office Action relies on the newly cited Skopp reference to allegedly show features of

S/N: 09/222,554
Response to Office Action dated 4/18/06
Amendment dated 7/18/06

the claims. For example, as to claim 1, the Office Action states that Skopp discloses “automatically determining a content data of the given information unit by searching the given information unit,” and “automatically selecting the chosen information unit as a function of” the content data of the given information unit. The support for this assertion is found at Col. 5, lines 26-35 and 58-67. The two paragraphs incorporating this cite are reproduced below:

The off-line user could select an advertisement from the banner 240 to automatically initiate the limited access to the Internet 100. The user PC 200 would request and receive Web page information through a Web proxy 510 and proxy control processor 530, and the Web page associated with the selected advertisement would be displayed. Although the user would be allowed to view a pre-determined list of related Web pages, other Web page requests would be rejected by the system 510, 530.

and

The client access control application 210 also resides on the user PC 200. The client access control application 210 can be used to initiate a Web browsing session. For example, the client access control application 210 can display an index of advertisements to a user. When the user selects an advertisement from the index, the client access control application 210 can activate the browser application 220 and obtain a Web page associated with that advertisement. As explained in detail below, the user will only be allowed to access the Web page, or group of Web pages, associated with that advertisement. If desired, the user can then select a different advertisement from the index and view its associated Web page or pages.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action is reading too much into these sections of Skopp. The sections above merely state that a single Web page or multiple Web pages are associated with a selected advertisement. The term “associated” refers to normal database storage in that looking up the selected advertisement in a database will return a database record that includes pointers or entries to the web-page(s) that the user will be able to access.

S/N: 09/222,554
Response to Office Action dated 4/18/06
Amendment dated 7/18/06

There is nothing in Skopp that teaches or suggests that the content of web-pages is automatically determined by searching the web-pages. Skopp is very clear that it intends to limit web-access to a user to a particular subset of web-pages (Col. 5, lines 36-38). Also, it is noted that the advertisement that is being selected is from an e-mail message sent by the advertiser (see Col. 5, lines 20-25). Such does not “imply” an automatic searching of the content of web-pages, but rather implies an active decision by the advertiser to limit access to its pre-approved web-pages. Nothing in the text of Skopp either directly or implicitly teaches or suggests the features of claim 1 as stated in the Office Action. The Office Action repeats its use of the Skopp reference in each of the rejections of the remaining independent claims, and the arguments above apply to these claims as well.

The remaining cited references fail to make up for the deficiencies of Skopp.

The cited section of Broder (Col. 5, lines 52 to Col. 6, line 6) is referring to “connectivity” between web pages (i.e., web-page 1 includes links to web-pages 2-5, web-page 2 includes links to web-pages 1 and 6-8, etc.). Rankings can be done based on distance, D, between web-pages. Cooper has been cited for its ranking algorithm based on an index search (similar to what is described in the present application with respect to the Alta Vista, Infoseek, and Yahoo sites). The Markovitz and Yu references have been discussed in great detail in prior Responses.

Since features of the presently claimed invention are missing from the cited references, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 and 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

S/N: 09/222,554
Response to Office Action dated 4/18/06
Amendment dated 7/18/06

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 7/18/06

By:



Shawn W. O'Dowd
Reg. No. 34,687

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 220-4200 telephone
(202) 220-4201 facsimile
DC1-620292